

SPEAKER LUEDTKE: Senator Lamb, do you wish to say anything further with regard to your amendment? All right. Those of you who wish to speak, do you wish to speak to the Lamb amendment? Senator Carsten, you want to speak to the Lamb amendment?

SENATOR CARSTEN: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I believe that the Lamb amendment to the Newell amendment, as well as the Newell amendment itself, is only reiterating what the Board of Equalization can and should be doing now. It would appear.... I appreciate Senator Newell's attempt to make it more palatable. I really don't think that we're going to do too much with the bill if we amend it this way. It would appear that we'll only be reverting right back to where we are now. I think the Board of Equalization, in its wisdom and the projections that it has to the best of its knowledge, tries desperately to do that now. But for various factors that are involved it's difficult to make it come out to exact numbers and dollars. From time to time it varies one way and the other. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER LUEDTKE: Chair recognizes Senator Kahle. Do you wish to speak to the Lamb amendment to the Newell amendment?

SENATOR KAHLE: Mr. Chairman, members of the body, I think that we're accused many times of passing bills that are not necessary. I do not support any of the amendments or the bill. Thank you.

SPEAKER LUEDTKE: Chair recognizes Senator Dworak. Do you wish to speak to the amendment, Senator Dworak?

SENATOR DWORAK: I rise in support of Senator Lamb's amendment. I think we'd get over the problem of semantics, as to definition between "shall" and "should". The two words have very fine differential in meaning. They both indicate and imply an obligation, a future obligation and a necessity. I think the Lamb amendment, coming in with the word "may", accomplishes exactly what Senator Newell would like to do because he's indicating he doesn't like a word as strong as "shall". Consequently, he's gone to a word less strong with "should". But I think the similarity between the two words are very close. Senator Lamb, in his wisdom, has come forward with the word "may" which accomplishes what Senator Newell initially attempted to accomplish.

SPEAKER LUEDTKE: Senator Frank Lewis.

SENATOR F. LEWIS: Mr. President, certainly I think all of you would be interested to note that this part of the kind of exercise that appears on a competency test, in terms of minimum competency. So perhaps we could bring that forward. We could even use "can" if we wanted to now. The question, I guess, that comes to us is in terms of semantics. Those words are very clear and they're easy to define. "Shall" means you must. "Should" means you ought to. "May" means you can if you want to. That is very clear. There is not a close difference between "shall" and "should", neither is there in "may", other than the fact that they both start with the same letter, which some people have trouble with that because literation is important to them, repetition of the initial sound. I don't know, in terms of what we're trying to do, but I think the "may" part of this particular bill destroys anything that the bill would say. The bill